

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/681,677 05/18/2001		05/18/2001	Eric Clifton Matteson	30-GF-1099	3677	
23465	7590	09/20/2005		EXAMINER		
JOHN S.	BEULIC	K	FOX, JAMAL A			
		TEASDALE, LLP	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
SUITE 26		ΓAN SQUARE	2664			
ST LOUIS, MO 63102-2740				DATE MAILED: 09/20/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/681,677	MATTESON ET AL.	
Examiner '	Art Unit	
Jamal A. Fox	2664	

	Jamal A. Fox	2664						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 29 August 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of		e dia atau dia atau di tahun 19						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO								
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) and the consensiate exte	onaion for bour					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL								
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).								
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>								
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);								
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or		educing or simplifying	the issues for					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	, ,	jected claims.						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s	121. See attached Notice of Non-Co	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).					
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).		, timely filed amendm	ient canceling					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro		ill be entered and an	explanation of					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:								
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-20</u> .		·						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action. In	ut hofore or on the date of filing a N	lation of Appeal will n	est he entered					
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).								
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after ϵ	entry is below or attac	:hed.					
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu see attachment.	at does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).								
13. Other:								

Art Unit: 2664

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 8/29/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dobbins et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,790,546). Claims 1, 7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Picazo, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,006,275).

Applicant argued that Dobbins et al. does not describe or suggest the connectivity device including a repeater device, and a central processing unit located within the network connectivity device and configured to communicate with a network hub device located within the network connectivity device, the network repeater device, and a network switch device located within the network connectivity device, where the network repeater device configured to amplify communication transmissions to extend a distance between the communications devices, the network hub device configured to interconnect the communication devices by bringing segments of the wire network together, and the network switch device configured to reduce communication collisions by providing communication transmissions from the communications devices with independent paths through the wire network. However, one skilled in the art would recognize that a repeater module is disclosed in (col. 13 lines 34-41). A CPU is disclosed in (Fig. 5 ref. sign 41, Fig. 6 ref. sign CPU, col. 13 lines 54-67, col. 14 lines 17-45, col. 15 lines 50-56, col. 26 lines 64-67 and col. 32 lines 37-67). A switch module is disclosed in (Fig. 5 ref. sign 40 and col. 13 lines 54-67). A hub module is a bridge or router that is disclosed in (col. 4 lines 13-27, col. 24 lines 30-61 and col. 26 lines 38-57). Art Unit: 2664

One skilled in the art would also recognize that the limitations of each module being configured to perform certain task are inherent.

Applicant argued that Picazo, Jr. et al. does not describe or suggest the connectivity device including a network repeater device, and a central processing unit located within the network connectivity device and configured to communicate with a network hub device located within the network connectivity device, the network repeater device, and a network switch device located within the network connectivity device, where the network repeater device configured to amplify communication transmissions to extend a distance between the communications devices by bringing segments of the wire network together, and the network switch device configured to reduce communication collisions by providing communication transmissions from the communications devices with independent paths through the wire network. However, one skilled in the art would recognize that a repeater is disclosed in (Fig. 2 ref. sign 90 and Fig. 4 ref. signs 262 and 288). A CPU is disclosed in (Fig. 2, ref. sign 144, Fig. 3 ref. sign 126 and col. 9 lines 29-67). A hub module is disclosed in (Fig. 2 ref. sign 140 and col. 9 lines 29-46). A switch module is disclosed in (Fig. 2 ref. sign 150, Fig. 3 ref. sign 112, col. 9 lines 29-46 and col. 10 lines 46-57). One skilled in the art would also recognize that the limitations of each module being configured to perform certain task are inherent.

Jamal A. Fox

WISORY PATENT EXAM